

Transformation of the Government Employee's Culture of Working Performance

An Interpretive Strategy of Organization Communication

Johar Perman

Abstract

Transformation refers to a change of form and characteristic of an organization. One example could be a change from being accustomed to working under instructions to working with initiatives and quality or corporate-based orientation. Transformation has something to do with a possibility and deals with a generating process of becoming aware of the existence of influence creative soul brings to the working environment. It leads to working by way of what mind expects. The present transformation of the Government employee's culture of working performance still gives some impression of being bureaucratic-formalistic, obsolete, and slow in terms of giving services. This phenomenon certainly leads to customer dissatisfaction. Although attempts of changing the culture of working performance has been initiated since 1985 followed with the incidence of reformation in 1998, the expected results have yet been achieved. The present study reports on gaining an interpretive description of strategy of organization communication which brings with it some possibility of enhancing the Government employee's culture of working performance. Two theoretical frames of reference are applied in this writing, namely the cultural theory of organization and the theory of organizing, complemented with the writer's experience being a participant observer during the years of 2005 and 2006 in one of the offices of education in West Java, Indonesia. Through observation, document study, interview, and focus group discussion, the findings reveal that the employee's culture of working performance remains transitional and leaves with it less conducive working environment. Nevertheless, various strategies of organization communication involving actively employee in the varietal self organizing level of the lower, middle and dignitary layers has urged a change of betterment in terms of working performance from bureaucratic-hierarchic to quality-based working performance.

Key words: Transformation, Culture of Working Performance, Strategy of Organization Communication

The Concept of Transformation (of the culture of working performance)

Transformation termed as a change in form and characteristic (KBBI, 1996:1070) has often been interchangeably used with the term *change*. Hornby (1995:1270) says that *transform* means *to change the appearance or the character of something completely*. Taylor (available at http://www.mattaylor.com/public/paper/transformation_process.htm, 04/29/2009) was cited while saying *I want to warn*

you about the idea that transformation can be planned, managed and 'talked' into reality. An organization cannot be transformed through traditional ways. Nor can it be built in a sudden. Instead, it emerges as a consequence of many aspects and the process of comprehending a set of facts. K. Ferlic through <http://transformingtheorganization.com> of April 24, 2009 explains *Transforming the Heart of the Organization*. Transformation of organization refers more to an awareness of the influence of a creative soul on a working environment, and execute what one's mind wants to do some action than just a matter of business.

The present study brings with it some optimism emphasizing that a quality-based cultural change of work culture for government employee can take place. Muiz (2004) contends that the essence of organizational change is a change of individual's behavior. Covey (1993) and Triguno (2000:29) says that an individual (a government employee) has a strong commitment to endeavor a change because of four potentials including self-awareness, heart feeling, freedom of self actualization, and creative imagination. McGregor perspective denotes that an employee has a strength to do thing for a change as revealed from the concept of the Y Theory which differs from the X Theory (Robbins, 1996; Alih Bahasa Pujaatmaka, 1996, Jilid I: 200-201) or what is in line with a number of premises as found in the Independent Theory from Infate, Rancer and Womack (no year:307) and Denzin's concept (1987) saying that

..... an active individual perceives an object, himself, others, events, and actions so that a new self-image, a new language, new relationships with others, and new ties with social and organizational structures (author: a new culture of working)

Transformation in itself is complex, taking turns in terms of its existence, vanishing and living on a certain period of the trajectories of the employee' working experiences, having connected with the organizational external and internal and the combination of them. Finger and Ruchat (2000) come up with transformation in the form of adaptation or anticipation which can deals with a part or the whole part of the organization. In the literatures, it can be inferred that transformation is not a revolutionary change but an evolutionary change instead. Ndraha (1997:21) explains that an issue of transformation culture is not an instant matter since it is tied with the values of transmission. Values are considered highly valuable, ideal, and they even lived with their very own intentions, they represent soul and abstract.

The culture of working as a product of some context, structure or a function, and a reflection of those who are involved in their work (Moeljono, 2005:9) is urged to make efforts for a change of betterment. Ultimately, whatsoever, a transformational change of working culture is a quality-oriented issue and comprises values, attitude and the way government employee carries out their duties. The change in discussion emphasizes the importance of: (1) customers satisfaction, (2) active management generated by the top management officer in terms of continuous quality enhancement,

(4) preventing assets from being degraded, and (5) a philosophy holding belief that quality is way of life (Vincent, 1992:58; Gordon, 1995). The culture of working associated with duties leading to established routines might indeed have slim chance to a change (Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia, 1991). However, as a state of mind and mental (Wiranata, 2002), a change in working culture is a possibility. Mintzberg in Djokosantoso (2005:6) was quoted when revealing that *.....the functions of those working at an organization, the way an organization is constructed, and the environment..... in which the organization is operating....*

The Condition of Working Culture (Transitional) of the Government Employee

In reality, a quality-oriented working culture of the Government employee is still far from being perfect. It is likely that the culture should be created through instructions, driven or controlled tightly objectively by the management officers. What is still going on is that the working performance remains mechanical, a very low degree of satisfaction in terms of working relationship among the employees, and not yet representing a working team with dynamics and full participation among themselves. The culture they maintain seems to be the one as instructed by their managers or the regulations imposed by the organization. The culture indicates that it is still far from the orientation of symbolic vision emphasizing that an organization carries with it an interactive, dynamic communication which leads to a continuous change. In other words, transformation does not sound like having something to do subjectively (interpretive) with self-awareness on the employee's part or, does not deal with a philosophy and way of life of the employee. It even does not have any relationship with values they supposedly adopt. The culture has not been seen as characteristics, habitual endeavors and the power of encouragement for the sake of the organization's advancement. The employee's behavior is not yet existent as working reality and sincere accomplishments.

Vision, mission, strategy and the goal of the program almost every state organization formulates are actually promising for a goal to achieve through initiating a change or transforming a working culture. Nevertheless, the vision, mission, strategy and the goal of the program as set by the organization remains ceremonial and serves as some sort of accessories – merely stuffing the organization file. What seems to be the reality here is that the messages of change become so textual, abstract, and have not yet been socialized. Instead, the implementation of the messages go fictive. Most employees refer to no core values of the organization while the values are actually the fundamentals from which the employees taught to work under organizational policies. What makes things worse is the fact that understanding on the values proves to be various and individual making it end up with rejection or at least attitude towards disobedience.

Some empirical data of the facts denote that the prototype of the employee's working culture is in its transitional phase, that is, in between the un-freezing phase (dismissing the traditional values and obsolete ways) and the changing phase (the change as expected and as the employee wants). The existing culture of working has a bureaucratic-hierarchical image and is still leaving us with some sort of faking obedience, prestige-oriented work performance, insufficient skill of performing work achievement, cost-ineffectiveness, personal integrity in accomplishing the work on the employee's part although is certain that the government employee's working culture has moved to a culture of quality-oriented accomplishment.

A Change of Employee's Working Culture is Due Urged

Actually, understanding the need to make a change come into being is not that difficult. However, understanding that the working culture does not belong to merely the management poses a challenge. All employees should be made aware that openness to the attempts of generating the culture is crucial. Pace and Faules explain that the analysis on a culture is not geared toward what must be achieved from the perspectives of the management. Instead, it is an analysis emphasizing on what is really going on in the work environment. Organizational culture is worth establishing to every organization and even to all members of an organization. Pace and Faules further explains that the size of an organization does not matter that much. What counts is the existence of organizing activities.

Cameron and Quinn (1999) show systematic (and objective) ways of creating a conducive environment of working culture, from the phase of diagnosing to the steps of designing the process of changing organizational culture. Interpretive concept views the process of culture transformation this way: it is not an obligation that totally forces individuals to work under the management's instructions implemented through a top-down bureaucracy. Transformation should be viewed as the object of learning through the employee's opinion and participation during his working times leading to the emergence of a change. Transformation is not a fixed set of rules of the organization but it is a truly whole of commitment inherent in the work experience and the importance of human as seen by each employee. Transformation derives from a reality that an employee acts as an actor interacting during a certain period of time, attempting some meaningfulness for every symbol met and organizing in such a way that eventually constructing a new culture of working in the written or oral form, seen or hidden, internal or external with a relevant contextual scale of analysis.

The characteristics of evolutionary culture of transformation denote that transformation needs patience and sufficient time (Finger and Ruchat, 2000). Transformation can even take years to take place (Ndraha, 1997:76). Working to a Government's employee reflects a normative experience which demands one's self-actualization, role

organizing and inter-institutional relationships so that a change of working culture can gradually be achieved. Pepper (1995) emphasizes a matter of transformation on socialization as a possibility for an adequate cultural reproduction to happen. The concept of socialization refers to the employee's activeness in the process of negotiating meaning (communication) and is transactional in characteristics. The concept of socialization of someone in the function of working culture reproduction according to Pepper (1995) is a representation of the newcomer experience in an organization. An employee is supposed to adapt the new situation, actively reducing uncertainties inherently and continuously emerge from his social position in his work.

Karl Weick (Pace and Faules; Editor: Mulyana, 1998) says that the organization of working culture results from the process of organizing, and because of that the writer has an opinion that the working culture is a result coming from the process of organizational communication. It means that a study on transformation of employee's working culture and organizational communication relate to Weick's theory of organizing. Pace and Faules (Editor: Mulyana, 1998:30) contend that *Organizational communication refers to 'the existing behaviors of organizing' and how those who are involved in the process deal with transaction and give meaning on what is going on*. Based on the theory of organizing, an organization is not the structure but it is a process or an activity. Weick views the structure as a form of regular patterns of intertwined behaviors. These intertwined behaviors function to reduce uncertainties as the key to organizational effectiveness. Organizing behavior as an activity of communication results in structure or organization. Organizing, as defined by Weick, refers to grammatical (the regulations, that is), convention, and the practice of an organization. This grammatical matter is acknowledged through commitment by intertwined wise behavior. The acknowledgement through the commitment denotes that the reality of working culture derives from experiences gained together and is acknowledged by other people through the symbol systems.

The Role of Organizational Communication

To a working culture of the Government's employee which mainly puts forward quality or services with entire reliability, responsiveness, confidence, empathy and tangibility (Kolter, 1985), the role of communication would not solely be as a tool of handling behavior and the artifact of an organization. Communication is considered as more than just a one-way action (Mulyana, 2000:61), related to the process of cause and effect (Mulyana, 2000) or, a matter of transaction (Mulyana, 2000). Pepper (1995) makes it clear when saying:

In the transaction, however, meaning emerges from the combination of communicative participants within a specific context. Rather than being the content of words, meaning is the results of a complex communicative process that includes words, intentions, contexts, histories, and attitudes.

Communication here refers to forming the meaning and as such, transformation of working culture thus requires understanding. *Daily conversation* (i.e. done by the employees) *reveals understanding on the organization and common network of meaning available* (Pace and Faules; 1998). They say that an organizational communication is referred to as follows:

Man *creates* his reality. Pay good attention to the fact that reality (of an organization) is a subjective construction prone to inexistence when its members do not consider it the way it is. More specifically, an organizational communication is the process of *creating* meaning from the interaction that *creates*, maintains, and changes the organization.

If so, the organizational communication (which is vertical, horizontal, diagonal, circular, internal, external, verbal, non-verbal) becomes interactive, various, functioning and coordinating, integrative, and facilitating the transformation of quality-oriented working culture. Putting forward the involvement of the employees in performing their work, the organizational communication as an inherent, decisive, and critical process results in productivity, quality, and vitality including a transformative culture of working. The manner in which employees work certainly undergoes practical ways and will always be involved in the arrangement and implementation of working plan to achieve the goal as expected. Organizational communication is a mediator among the human resources and the function of the organization as well as the results the organization brings with it (Pace and Faules; 2001).



Karl Weick states that an organization is a result from the process of organizing (Pace and Faules; Editor: 2001) or a grammatical matter of the process of organizational communication. Hence, intertwined behaviors among the employee's work prove to be a conversation or a form of transaction which builds the culture of working. The process of organizing among the members of an organization, according to Pepper (1995), then takes place within five levels as follows:

- Level 5: Technological level – the human-machine interface
- Level 4: Intergroup level – the we – them understanding
- Level 3: Small-group level – the difficulties of group dynamics
- Level 2: Dyadic level – making sense of someone else's sense
- Level 1: Individual level – making sense of the surroundings

According to Pepper (1995) an experience (of working) shows career transitioner that must be understood as stereotypical newcomer. The career transitioner results in the levels of change, surprise and contrast on work/ working situation encouraging an employee to adopt a number of strategies in the process of communication combined with the formal-informal, individual-collective, sequential-nonsequential, fixed-variable, tournament-contest, serial-disjunctive, and investiture-disinvestiture manners (Pepper 1995).

Interpretive Communication to Enhance the Working Culture

The present study reveals that there are various grammatical matters (strategies) in the organizational communication which develops at the levels of self organizing on the part of the Government's employee strengthening the dynamics of quality-oriented transformation of the working culture.

1. Self-organizing: restlessness (uncertainties) to the varied messages of change and the intensity of applying the organizational communication.

Empirical data from the facts found show that the objective of the communication to transform the working culture is reflected from the formulation of vision, mission and the program of the organization. However, each employee's restlessness to implement the purpose and objective of communication or messages of the change in the working culture proves to be of paramount importance and, it does not always to be the same. At the basic level, the main restlessness seems to be the fulfillment of convenient working condition (of a place), well-prepared facilities, and the increasing degree of prosperity; at the middle level, the restlessness turns out to be the enhancement of working capability because of the emergence of challenges and newly-assigned work; as for the management level, the restlessness emerges in the form of the staff's working condition which is not yet equivalent to the target while at the same time the capacity is still limited and the financial problem is problematic as well. The different communication messages at the basic, middle, and top management levels are fundamental since each employee does the internal dialog: showing some understanding (meaning, argumentation, belief, and praxis) on the messages (of change) as expected (goal attainment).

As far as the restlessness and varied messages of change are concerned, working manner, intensity and the application of communication are also different among the top management and the employee. It proves to be unavoidable that the communication message with elements of change is the management's more as compared to the employee's. Tasks and duties are especially the subordinate employee's. The subordinate employee's intensity of communication is concentrated on how well a task or duty is understood and how accomplishable is the work done with satisfactory results within a given time.

The nature of how well the work is accomplished and how well-understood the instructions is the subordinate employee to concern. This corridor of accomplishing the work on the employee's part leads to a real change of working culture. To the managers, the intensity of communication is geared on their awareness and the roles they play in terms of how much they concern to attempt a change by implementing all their managerial functions.

Different messages as clearly seen, intensity and application of communication do not necessarily mean that the managers should always be the leading party for a change. Instead, it is the manager's care that matters: encouraging a change with the context and ties within the working conditions as well as the hierarchy among the employees. When it comes to the phase that the analysis of change deals with the *basic rules* that the employee anywhere assumes the responsibility to collect information, making efforts to understand, conveying messages, coordinating, avoiding conflicts or handling any disturbances, and anticipating potential risks of the message of change, the intensity of communication should provide opportunities for the employee to reconsider those matters involved within the rules set in their working conditions. The employee should therefore confide in the truth that they attempt self-organizing for institutionalization for a change in the working culture within themselves.

Along with the varied messages of communication, uncertainties serve as psychological condition recorded from the employee's working experience at all levels of the organization. The uncertainties the employee has to face include unclear instructions or work assignments, the manager's expectation which is not always in line with the changes in working conditions, organizational structure frequently changed even if it is still in discussion, and newly assigned tasks which bring with them some implication to the employee's career development. All this indicates that in his working place the employee has to generate self-organizing through an internal dialog although the process is rather difficult to predict. What seems to be the bottom line is that the fact of uncertainties does not have to be minimized through the selected messages conveyed. Characteristics of the uncertainties are inherently grown as a communication strategy at dyadic level in order to maintain the restlessness (serving as the control on the process going on) and to reinforce the availability of a creative opportunity to the employee regardless the fact that the opportunity put him into an even more tasks and business with their growing number and complexities.

2. The Meaningfulness of Working: Communication of Strategy at the Dyadic Level

The uncertainties experienced by the almost all employees is transitional and natural in sense. The organizational communication strategy needed and has something to do with the uncertainties is not linear with the need to accomplish a task assigned or the manager's instruction. Nor is it a way of solving a problem. The communication expected to take place is a dialogical and intensive interaction between two employees to decode a different, contrasted message and to alleviate him from his being isolated from the working place. The direction of working culture transformation explains that the communication is varied at the dyadic level and it ranges from telling very personal problems, complaining, giving ideas, questioning incentives and leadership, considering and comparing services to making a dialog with strategic change of organization as the topic. The core business of the dyadic communication is that the employee attain useful impacts and get some meaning from his working experience. The transformation of working culture is realized through employee's working behavior by way of the chance to communicate in a dyadic manner to get meaningfulness of the message of change.

The reality of work performance shows that the change in working culture proves to be more focused and leads to an artifact observable when it comes to the chance that employees of the middle level maintain and develop dyadic communication especially through interpersonal or face-to-face communication with the employees of the subordinate level. Another dialog forces an awareness to emerge some reflection on continuous work accomplishment although limitations hamper. To the employees of subordinate level, the dialog about the change in working culture lies on the meaning of being loyal in doing the work as instructed by the management officer and in giving technical administrative services to the management or anyone who needs to be served. To the employees of the middle level, the dialog for a change takes place through the way they make arguments and comes up with dynamic organizational communication. As for the managers, the main dialog for a change is reflected by the implementation of all managerial functions realized through the work performance accomplished by the employees of the middle level and those belonging to the subordinate level.

3. Recorded Differences for the Dynamics of the Group Communication

When it comes to the uncertainties such as unclearness, differences, contrasts, being isolated, and various ideas to go through the dyadic level and leads to the group level, the process of identifying the uncertainties is geared to a big leap of progress. Self-organizing at the group level explains that the message for a change gets stronger, more structured and denotes some group support. Hence,

the need for the communication strategy for the employee (representing the group identity) or among the group of employees to happen is to explain and appreciate the identity, the process and results of the group work, maintain the senses of tolerance and even the initial efforts or group agenda where within the adequate given time can grow into sub-culture of the organization. At the group level, when consensus is not the major prerequisite, differences serve as the main necessity and force the dynamics of critical, useful organizational communication as well.

Problems rise frequently when the managers and the employee of various levels of organization are not yet accustomed to accept the variety of opinions, and question the basic value of an action considered as controversial. Such condition tends to ignite a homogenous situation. Even worse, the differences are not fruitful anymore and are not likely moved on to a wider group level. Interpretive strategy is supposed to generate continuous communication around the differences at the group level. Communication strategy is indeed complex and challenging. The common thread suggests that the differences be maintained, the chances be provided, roles and power be exercised, thoughts be discussed, and the employee's leadership be made fruitful. Communication patterns developed demands some sort of variation. They are even very temporary in nature so that the differences evolve in flexible process and which in turn would attain the change as expected. Technically, this session should generate creativity and useful work such as scheduling meeting of idea-sharing, proper sessions of personal thoughts, forming a task force or an ad hoc group work for every crucial, critical work, and providing rooms for training. All of which should fulfill self-organizing at a group level so that the form of common behavior of a group or a new culture of working emerges.

4. Developing Communication at the Organizational Level

A quality-oriented culture of working, especially at a transitional phase for a government organization seems to require some prerequisites in the form of transmission values of caring and attention (at the management level), dynamics (at the middle level), loyalty (at the subordinate level), and endeavor leadership in service excellence. The findings of the present study suggest that the manifestation of services value for the employee at the subordinate level needs to have technical skills; for the employee at the middle level needs to exercise professionalism and personal integrity; for the managers at the top management level need to have commitment. The aforementioned phenomena sound different from a pattern of involving employees in preparing *Rencana Strategik* (Strategic Planning) following the pattern of organizational vision-mission-strategy or *top-middle-bottom*. The tradition of working seems like *to begin from the top management* and then kept continuing to every working unit at the middle and subordinate levels which in turn forms a common pattern of

working behavior at the subordinate level. In response to Talcott's (2009) theory of culturing (<http://ssrl.uchicago.edu/PRELIMS/Theory/parsons.html>), organizational communication, adversely, is the foundation of the processes of institutionalization, socialization, internalization, and control from which role the employee plays as a potential, active and creative actor.

Value transmission as the essence of working culture transformation will always be loaded with internalization and adaptation which brings with it high standard values and is related to a relatively long, complex, dynamic working system of accomplishments. It is the employee's business to keep it sustainable. It means that the success of changing the working culture derives a great deal from the employee's capability with his concern of restlessness in terms of great values and his ability to transmit it into his working environments he is facing. When employees of the subordinate level get instructed from their manager or, anyone involved in a monolog (instructive) communication, the honesty or self-actualization values emerges. The time when working communication becomes so intense in transaction or involving a mode of transaction, the values of fairness emerge. When communication between employees or a group with dialogic characteristics, the egalitarian values emerge. When the situation involves dignitaries, employees of the middle level and employees of the subordinate level with the elements of ethnics, gender, senior-junior, the nature of communication turns to be more interactive, and, the transformative values thus needed would be more to tolerance values.

When it comes to a value being incompatible with the demand of communication characters, the process for a change will be made less flowing by obstacles. Part of the reason is that the employees might give an impression of being not bright, being given no exact choice of values left, and being less skillful in communicating apart from the fact that the context of communication has always been taken into consideration and it has always been complex. This complexity thus brings with it a careful attitude, wisdom, and the feeling of empathy to one another. When the communication manages to overcome (i.e. to integrate) differences in giving opinions, competitive situation, or confrontation, what would likely be referred is the values of humble obedience, the heartfelt care, and viewing the action of working as a submission. Great values will always be referred to and will be counted into account as a prerequisite worth considering consciously by the employee. This awareness on the employee's part goes along with the transformative organizational communication.

Self organizing resulted from the employee's work life gives room to learn organizational communication as a massive movement leading to managing oneself, managing oneself and another, managing oneself and a group of people or a team, and eventually managing oneself and an organization. That way, it encourages interaction which explains mutual transformation because self-

organizing strengthens a better participation of working, lasts continuously and goes through the territory of authority, power, hierarchy, and management. Its application gives an impression of being integrated in terms of the employee's being demanded to produce quality work. A change is not something to wait or something kept in hand, but it is something which demands constants self-organizing. The interpretive strategy of organizational communication suggests that a typical control as exercised by the management be released to form a self-control urging the employee to adapt well anywhere in a working environment with a small scale or the overall integration of the widely ranged organization.

CONCLUSION

The present study concludes that varied strategies of organizational communication which actively involve employee at the level of self-organizing which gets various forms at the subordinate, middle, and management levels contributes a great deal to the betterment of working culture (transformation that is) from bureaucratic-hierarchical to quality-oriented working culture. The working culture which is strong, various, dynamic, and consisting of a focus of orientation in great values transmission especially heartfelt care, dynamics, and loyalty is promising and accountable in terms of serving with excellence within the framework of employee's continuous working system. This in turn will accelerate the realization of transformation of the government employee's working culture. However, the position of transformation is transitional. It is between the phase of un-freezing process and the phase of changing for new responses needed (the changing process). Hence, the transformation is meaningful in terms of a learning process experienced by employee in the working place to abandon old or obsolete values, and to initiate new values or new working paradigm with more enhanced quality.

Transitional reality shows uncertainties experienced by the employee in understanding the direction, the message of change and the working environment. The application of communication becomes more focused and turns out to be artifacts observable for a change and enhancement the working culture when the employee feel restless doing intra personal communication intensively. The strategy continues with self-organizing in the mode of inter-personal communication. The strategy of dyadic communication among the employee or between the employee and the management takes place to discuss through a dialog about the contrast messages and the uncertain condition experienced by the employee so that the employee understands the meaning, usefulness and an awareness to do some reflection of improvement in his work performance.

The strategy of group communication does not necessarily means looking for consensus. Instead, it continuously encourages dynamics and a communication pattern around the real different, temporary and flexible pattern so that it grows with evolution

a sub-culture in a quality-oriented work. The differences of messages do not prove to be a source of conflict among the employees. Instead, they serve as potentials or the need which encourages variety, intensity, and the application (development) of interactive or transactional organizational communication strategy. This could function as a way of differing the manager's role from that of the employee's in creating a change of working culture. Group communication strategy is not a way of looking for consensus between the differences or a way of simplifying contradiction and interest. Both the differences and the interest are to be explained thoroughly and then put into a different and temporary function of working or, into flexibly formed function of working (ad-hoc).

Structure of organization is basically flexible in adapting for the demand of a change and it supports for a long period of time. Attempts of staying alive for a short term can be guaranteed by the charge of long term support. Being involved with evolution-socio-cultural-organizational manner including even technologies, employee can start making a small scale of change up to the organizational level to generate an action of mutual transformation going through authority limitations, hierarchy, and management. Therefore, employee's success or failure in developing his career is equivalent to the process with evolution-socio-cultural-organizational manner in terms of realizing the values and the ways of working with quality orientation.

SUGGESTION

The findings of the present study reveal that the essence of working culture transformation is a transmission of great values. Further study with wider scope and deeper analysis on value transmission of working culture prioritizing great values such as submission, pioneering, expertise, services or collaboration, hard work and accountability is suggested. Other than that, the present study also suggests that top management of the organization be more intensive in developing interpersonal communication implemented in transitional phases with the employee of middle and subordinate levels as have been much suggested by the messages for a change.

REFERENCES

Books:

- Adiwisastra, J. (2001). *Penataan Kembali Birokrasi Pemerintah Daerah dalam Pelaksanaan Otonomi Daerah*. Pidato pengukuhan jabatan Guru Besar dalam Ilmu Perilaku Organisasi pada Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Padjadjaran. Departemen Pendidikan Nasional: Universitas Padjadjaran.
- Beach, L. R. (1993). *Making The Right Decision; Organizational Culture, Vision and Planning*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc. Englewood Cliffs.
- Beare, H.; Caldwell, B. J. & Millikan, R. H. (1990). *Creating An Excellent School; Some New Management Techniques*. London: Routledge.

- Bertrand, B. (2002). Transformation Within Organizational Culture: The Gap Between Paper and Reality. Melalui <<http://www.weleadinlearning.org/bb-oct02.htm>> [24/05/2004].
- Cameron, K. S. & Quinn, R. E. (1999). *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture: Base on the Competing Values Framework*. Baltimore, MD: Addison-Wesley Publications.
- Cassell, C. & Symon, G. (1995). *Qualitative Methods In Organizational Research; A Practical Guide*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Cushman, D. P.; King, S. S. (Ed.). (2001). *Excellence In Communicating Organizational Strategy*. New York: State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Denzin, N.K.; Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- DeVito, J. A. (1996). *Human Communication*. Alih Bahasa: Maulana, Agus. 1997. *Komunikasi Antar Manusia, Kuliah dasar*. Jakarta: Professional Books.
- Djamin, A. (1994). Birokrasi dan Budaya Organisasi Pemerintah. *Manajemen Pembangunan*, No. 6/II, Januari 1994.
- Djojonegoro, I. W. (1997). Pengembangan Budaya Komunikasi dan Informasi Menuju Kehidupan Indonesia Modern. *Jurnal Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia: Komunikasi dan Budaya*. Jurnal 9 & 10. Jakarta: Kerjasama ISKI dengan Penerbit PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Drennan, D. (1992). *Transforming Company Culture; Getting Your Company From Where You Are Now To Where You Want To Be*. London: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Ferlic, K. . 2008. Transforming the Heart of the Organization. Melalui <<http://transformingtheorganization.com>> [24 april 2009].
- Fernanda, Desi. (2000). *Transformasi Aparatur & Birokrasi Daerah Dalam Menyongsong Otonomi Daerah*. Paper Pelatihan Otonomi Daerah. Bandung: Kerjasama Institution for Research of Social and Economic Development (IRSED) dengan Dinas Kota Cimahi.
- Hesselbein, Frances. 1999. The Key to Cultural Transformation. *Leader to Leader*. No. 12 Spring 1999. Melalui < <http://.pdf.org/leaderbooks/121/spring99/fh.html> > [23/07/2004].
- Klein, Stuart M. (1994). A Management Communication Strategy for Change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*. Melalui < <http://rosina.emerald-library.cpm/vl=91239435/cl=16/nw=1/rpsv/cgi-bin/emeraldft> > [23/07/2004].
- Koentjaraningrat. (1990). *Kebudayaan, Mentalitas dan Pembangunan*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia.
- Kotter, J.P. and Heskett, J.L. (1992). *Corporate Culture and Performance*. New York: The Free Press A Division Simon & Schuster Inc.
- Liliweri, A. 2004. *Wacana Komunikasi Organisasi*. Bandung: Mandar Maju.
- Littlejohn, S. W. (1996). *Theories of Human Communication*. Fifth Edition. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

- Moeljono, D. (2005). *Cultured Budaya Organisasi dalam Tantangan*. Jakarta: PT. Elex Media Komputindo.
- Mulyana, D. (1999). Kendala-Kendala Pengembangan Penelitian Komunikasi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia: Menuju Paradigma Baru Penelitian Komunikasi*. Vol III/April 1999. Bandung: Kerjasama ISKI dengan Penerbit PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mulyana, D. (2000). *Ilmu Komunikasi, Suatu Pengantar*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Ndraha, T. (1997). *Budaya Organisasi*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Pace, R. W. & Faules, D.F. (1998). *Komunikasi Organisasi; Strategi Meningkatkan Kinerja Perusahaan*. Penerjemah dan Editor: Mulyana, D. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Pepper, G.L. (1995). *Communicating In Organizations: A Cultural Approach*. International Editions. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Pepper, K & Thomas, L. H. (2002). Making A Change: The Effects of The Leadership Role on School Climate. Melalui <<http://www.springerlink.com/content/102953>> [06/07/2005].
- Robbins, S. P. (1996). *Organizational Behavior, Concepts, Controversies, Applications*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc. Englewood Cliffs. Alih Bahasa: Pujaatmaka, Hadyana. (1996). *Perilaku Organisasi; Konsep, Kontroversi, Aplikasi*. Jilid 1 dan 2. Jakarta: PT. Prenhallindo.
- Rogers, E. M. (1983). *Diffusion Of Innovation*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Sanchez, P. (1997). *Transformation Communication; The Communicator's Guide to Organizational Change*. San Francisco, CA: International Association Business Communicators (IABC).
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Siddal. (2003). Manusia dan Budaya. Melalui, <http://www.geocities.com/psmintura/artikel/manusia_dan_budaya_kerja.htm> [09/04/2005].
- Supriyadi, G. & Triguno. 2001. *Budaya Kerja Organisasi Pemerintah*. Republik Indonesia: Lembaga Administrasi Negara.
- Surat Keputusan Kepala BPKP Nomor: KEP-504/K/SU/2004 *Tentang Program Jangka Panjang Pengembangan Budaya Kerja Badan Pengawasan Keuangan Dan Pembangunan/BPKP 2005 – 2009*.
- Surat Keputusan Menpan Nomor: 25/KEP/M.PAN/4/2002 *Tentang Pedoman Pengembangan Budaya Kerja Aparatur Negara*.
- Talcott Parsons "An Outline of the Social System". Melalui <<http://ssr1.uchicago.edu/PRELIMS/Theory/parsons.html>> [29/04/2009].
- Taylor, MG. *ReDesigning the Future*. 1980. Melalui <http://www.mattaylor.com/public/paper/transformation_process.htm> [29/04/2009].
- Triguno. (2000). *Budaya Kerja; Menciptakan Lingkungan yang Kondusif Untuk Meningkatkan Produktivitas Kerja*. Jakarta: PT. Golden Terayon Press.

Jurnal Pemimpin

Tujuh Belas Pasang Nilai-nilai Dasar Budaya Kerja Aparatur Negara. Melalui <[http://www.deptan.go.id/setjen/ortala/berita/17 pasang_nilai_dasar.pdf](http://www.deptan.go.id/setjen/ortala/berita/17_pasang_nilai_dasar.pdf) # search = % 22 dasar % 20 budaya % >. [05/09/2006].

Veeger, K.J. Redaksi: Bertens, K. & Nugroho A.A. 1993. *Realitas Sosial; refleksi filsafat sosial atas hubungan individu-masyarakat dalam sejarah sosiologi*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

